arXiv:astro-ph/0306024v1 2 Jun 2003

Optical Flash of GRB 990123: constraints on the physical parameter of the reverse shock

Y. Z. Fan, Z. G. Dai, Y. F. Huang and T. Lu
Department of Astronomy, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, P. R. China
daizigao@public1.ptt.js.cn

ABSTRACT

The optical flash accompanying GRB 990123 is believed to be powered by the reverse shock of a thin shell. With the best fitted physical parameters for GRB 990123 (Panaitescu & Kumar 2001) and the assumption that the parameters in the optical flash are the same as those in the afterglow, we show that: 1) the shell is thick but not thin, and we have provided the light curve for the thick shell case which coincides with the observation; 2) the theoretical peak flux of the optical flash accounts for only 3×10^{-4} of the observed. In order to compensate this divergency, the physical parameters the electron energy ration and the magnetic ratio ϵ_e, ϵ_B should be 0.61, 0.39 respectively, which are much different from those in the late afterglow.

Subject headings: gamma-rays: bursts:theory

1. Introduction

BeppoSAX ushered in 1999 with the discovery of a super-bright γ-ray burst, GRB 990123. This GRB was intensively studied by many groups world wide. At that time this burst was notable for the richness of new results: the discovery of prompt optical emission by ROTSE (Akerlof et al. 1999), the discovery of the brightest optical afterglow and its redshift $z = 1.6004$ leads to a huge energy release of 1.6×10^{54}ergs in $\gamma-$rays alone (Briggs et al. 1999; Kulkarni et al. 1999a), and a break in the optical afterglow light curve (Fruchter et al. 1999; Castro-Tirado et al. 1999), and the radio flare (Kulkarni et al. 1999b). In the past three years, all of these phenomena have been discussed in great detail. For instance, the steepening of the r-band light curve from about $t^{-1.1}$ to $t^{-1.8}$ after two days might be due to a jet which has transited from a spherical-like phase to sideways expansion phase (Rhoads 1999; Sari, Piran & Halphern 1999; Huang et al 2000 a, b, c, d; Wei & Lu 2000).

The steeping might also be due to a dense medium which has slowed down the shock quickly to a non-relativistic one (Dai & Lu 1999).

The most natural explanation for the strong optical emission accompanying GRB 990123 is the synchrotron emission from a reverse shock propagating into the fireball ejecta after it interacts with the surrounding gas (Sari & Piran 1999; Mészáros & Rees 1999). Under this framework, the light curve of GRB optical flash in a homogenous medium or in a stellar wind and its corresponding Synchrotron self-Compton emission have been discussed in great detail (Kobayashi 2001; Wang, Dai & Lu 2001 a, b; Wu et al. 2002; Fan et al. 2002). Several authors attempted to constrain the intrinsic parameters, such as the Lorentz factor of the shocked fireball ejecta relative to the unshocked fireball ejecta (Γ_{rs})(Wang, Dai & Lu 2000; Sari & Piran 1999). It should be noted, however, that these estimates were made before accurate burst parameters for GRB 990123 were known, and consequently they include approximations and parameters from other GRB afterglows. Recently, by fitting the multi-frequency afterglow light curves, physical parameters for eight GRBs, including GRB 990123 have been reported (Panaitescu & Kumar 2001, hereafter PK01). This fitting has provided us the possibility to study this unique event more quantitatively. With these parameters Soderberg & Ramirez-Ruiz (2002, hereafter SR02) have estimated the prompt reverse shock emission to be expected for these eight bursts.

After a careful calculation with the parameters for GRB 990123 (we assume these parameters in the optical flash are the same as those in the late afterglow), in section 2 we find the shell is thick and we provide the adjusted light curve for the thick shell case which coincides with the observation. In section 3, we find the theoretical peak flux of the optical flash accounts for only 3×10^{-4} of the observed, if it is the reverse shock which accounts for the optical flash. In order to compensate this great divergency, the physical parameters of the electron energy ratio and magnetic field energy ratio ϵ_e, ϵ_B in the optical flash phase should be much different from those in the late afterglow phase. In the final section we make some discussions and give our conclusions.

2. Light curves of the reverse shock emission for the thick shell case

By fitting multi-frequency afterglow light curves, physical parameters for 8 GRBs have been reported in PK01. Best fitted parameters for GRB 990123 are: initial jet energy in afterglow phase $E_{j,50} = 1.5^{+3.3}_{-0.4}$, initial opening angle $\theta_0 = 2.1^{+0.1}_{-0.9}$deg, environment number density $n_{0,-3} = 1.9^{+0.5}_{-1.5}$, $\epsilon_{e,-2} = 13^{+1}_{-4}$, $\epsilon_{B,-4} = 7.4^{+23}_{-5.9}$, and the electron distribution power-law index $p = 2.28^{+0.05}_{-0.03}$.

The thin shell deceleration time, t_γ can be estimated by $t_\gamma \simeq 3E_{52}^{1/3}n_{0,5}^{-1/3}\eta_{300}^{-8/3}$ (Kobayashi 2000), where the parameters are scaled as $E_{52} = E/10^{52}$, $n_{0,5} = n_0/5cm^{-3}$, $\eta_{300} = \eta/300$, η is the initial Lorentz factor of the fireball at the end of the Gamma-ray burst, here we take its best estimated value $\eta = 900$ (SR02), E is the isotropic energy of the fireball in afterglow. With these parameters mentioned above we have $t_\gamma \simeq 8\mathrm{s} < \Delta/\mathrm{c} \simeq 20\mathrm{s}$, where $\triangle$ is the shell width. Therefore the shell is thick but not thin. In fact if the shell is thin, the reverse shock will be in sub-relativistic. However it is generally suggested that $\eta \simeq 900$ to 1200 (Wang, Dai & Lu 2000; SR02), and at the reverse shock crossing time Γ, the Lorentz factor of the fireball $\simeq 300$ (PK01), i.e. $\Gamma_{rs} \simeq 5/3$ to 2 which is mid-relativistic, so the shell should be thick. This conclusion coincides with the result of Wang, Dai & Lu (2000). Some authors argued that if the shell was thick, the theoretic light curve would be much different from what one observed (Sari & Piran 1999; Kobayashi 2000; SR02). Below we investigate that problem.

In the thick shell case, the reverse shock crosses the shell at $T \simeq \Delta/c$. At the reverse shock crossing time T the break frequency ν_m and the peak flux are

$$\nu_m = 10^{13}(\frac{p-2}{p-1})^2(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})^2(\frac{\epsilon_B}{10^{-3}})^{1/2}(\frac{n}{10^{-2}})^{1/2}(\frac{\Gamma_A}{300})^2(\Gamma_{rs}-1)^2\frac{1}{(1+z)}\mathrm{Hz}, \quad (1)$$

$$F_{\nu m} = 1.2\times 10^{-2}(\frac{D}{10^{28}})^{-2}\frac{N_e}{10^{52}}(\frac{\Gamma_A}{300})^2(\frac{n}{10^{-2}})^{1/2}(\frac{\epsilon_B}{10^{-3}})^{1/2}(1+z)\mathrm{Jy}, \quad (2)$$

where the relations $\gamma_m = (p-2)/(p-1)(m_p/m_e)\epsilon_e(\Gamma_{rs}-1)$ for $p > 2$, $F_{\nu m} = \frac{N_e\Gamma_A P_{\nu m}(1+z)}{4\pi D^2}$, $P_{\nu m} = \phi_p\frac{\sqrt{3}e^3B}{m_ec^2}$ and $B = 3.9\times 10^{-2}n_1^{1/2}(\epsilon_B/10^{-2})^{1/2}\Gamma_A$ have been used, Γ_A is the Lorentz factor of the shocked shell, Γ_{rs} is approximated by $(\Gamma_A/\eta+\eta/\Gamma_A)/2$ for Γ_A, $\eta \gg 1$, N_e is the total number of electrons in the shell, D is the luminosity distance (we assume $H_0 = 65$km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, $\Omega_M = 0.3$, $\Omega_\wedge = 0.7$), z is the redshift of the burst, ϕ_p is a function of p, whose value is ~ 0.6 for $p \sim 2.28$ (Wijers & Galama 1999).

The scalings before and after T in the homogenous medium case have been discussed by Kobayashi (2000). A difference between Kobayashi's and our scalings is: at early times the reverse shock is Newtonian (Kobayashi assumed it was relativistic), so $\Gamma_{rs}-1 \propto \Gamma_A^2 f^{-1}$, $\Gamma_A \simeq \eta$ (Sari & Piran 1995). In the thick shell case: the spreading is not important, then $f \equiv \frac{n_A}{n_1} \propto R^{-2}$. Noting $R \sim 2\Gamma_A^2 tc$, we have $f \propto t^{-2}$, i.e. $\Gamma_{rs}-1 \propto t^2$. Substituting this relation into equation (1) we obtain $\nu_m \propto t^4$. Noting $N_e(t) \propto t$ (Kobayashi 2000) and substituting this relation into equation (2), we have $F_{\nu m} \propto t$. For $\nu_m < \nu < \nu_c$ we have $F_\nu \propto t^{2(p-1)}F_{\nu m} \propto t^{2p-1}$.

For $\Gamma_{rs} \gg 1$, $(\Gamma_{rs}-1)^2\Gamma_A^2 \sim \eta^2/4$, equation (1) reduces to $\nu_m \sim$ constant, as the case suggested by Kobayashi (2000). Combining Kobayashi's results and ours we get the flux at

a given frequency ν, for $\nu_m < \nu < \nu_c$

$$F_\nu(t < T) \propto \begin{cases} t^{2p-1}, & \text{for } \Gamma_{rs} - 1 \ll 1, \\ t^{1/2}, & \text{for } \Gamma_{rs} - 1 \gg 1, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

$$F_\nu(t > T) \propto t^{-(73p+21)/96}. \tag{4}$$

The observed optical light curve of GRB 990123 at early times shows a fast rise and a slower decay, whose power-law indices are 3.3 and -2.0 respectively. On the other hand, for $p = 2.28$ we have $2p - 1 = 3.56$ and $-(73p + 21)/96 = -1.95$, then we expect that the light curve rises faster at early times (for a power-law index 3.56) then slowly (for a power-law index 0.5) before it reaches its peak. Unfortunately, the lack of data for the optical flash prevents us to check it more quantitatively. By now we have successfully explained the fast rise of $t^{3.3}$ and slow decay of $t^{-2.0}$ in the thick shell case.

3. The expected peak flux of the optical flash

With the best fit parameters of GRB 990123 afterglow for a homogeneous medium with 90% confidence level, we have (see in PK01): $M_{jet} \simeq 0.28 \times 10^{-6} M_\odot$, $\Gamma_0 \simeq 300$. Correspondingly, N_e and Γ_A in equation (2) are $N_e \simeq 5 \times 10^{53}$, $\Gamma_A \simeq 300$ respectively. The synchrotron spectrum for $\nu_m < \nu_{obs} < \nu_c$ is given by

$$F_{obs} = F_{\nu m}(\nu_{obs}/\nu_m)^{\frac{-(p-1)}{2}}. \tag{5}$$

Substituting equations (1) and (2) into equation (5) we have

$$F_{obs,peak} = 0.012 \times [0.14(\frac{p-2}{p-1})(\frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1})(\Gamma_{rs}-1)]^{p-1}[(\frac{\epsilon_B}{10^{-3}})(\frac{n}{10^{-2}})]^{\frac{p+1}{4}}(\frac{D}{10^{28}})^{-2}\frac{N_e}{10^{52}}(1+z)^{\frac{3-p}{2}}(\frac{\Gamma_A}{300})^{p+1}\text{Jy}. \tag{6}$$

When $\nu_{obs} = 5 \times 10^{14}$Hz, $\Gamma_{rs} - 1 \simeq 1$ and other best fitted parameters of GRB 990123 have been taken into calculation, we have $F_{obs,peak} = 3 \times 10^{-4}$Jy, which is much less than what we observed, $F_{peak} \simeq 1$Jy (Akerlof et al. 1999).

One may argue that if the optical flash was born in a dense envelope, for instance $n \simeq 40\text{cm}^{-3}$, the divergency will disappear. However, there is no more evidence for that. Another way is to assume that the physical parameters in the optical flash are different from those in the late afterglow, for example $\epsilon_e \simeq 0.61$, $\epsilon_B \simeq 0.39$ (n is the same as that in afterglow phase) can compensate this discrepancy safely. But this means in different phases (the GRB, very early afterglow and the late afterglow) the physical parameters may be much different. In fact, as early as in 2000, it has been proposed that the high energy

spectral power-law indices (β) for GRBs 970508, 990123, 990510, 991216 are -1.88, -2.30, -2.49, -2.00 respectively (Fenimore & Ramirez-Ruiz 2000), i.e., corresponding p in the GRB phase are 1.76, 2.60, 2.98, 2.00 respectively. However the best fitted p in the afterglow phase are 2.18, 2.28, 1.83, 1.36 respectively for these four GRBs (PK01). Obviously they are quite different.

Dai & Lu (1999) have proposed the dense medium model to explain the afterglow decay of GRB 990123. The parameters derived from that model are $\epsilon_e \sim 0.1$, $\epsilon_{B,-6} \sim 0.02$, $n \sim 3 \times 10^6$. In this case, if we set $\Gamma_A \simeq 300$, $N_e = E_{iso,\gamma}/\Gamma_0 m_p c^2$, $p = 2.3$, we have $F_{obs,peak} \simeq 1$Jy. However, according to the jump conditions of the shock, the Lorentz factor of the shocked shell should approximately equal to that of shocked ISM. The Lorentz factor of the forward shocked ISM could be obtained from the standard afterglow model (e.g. Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998): $\Gamma_{A,fs}(t) \simeq 6(\frac{E_{52}}{n})^{1/8}(\frac{t_d}{(1+z)})^{-3/8}$. For $E_{52} \sim 22$ and $n \sim 3 \times 10^6$, we have $\Gamma_{A,rs}(50s) = \Gamma_{A,fs}(50s) \simeq 32$, which is much below 300. From equation (6), such small $\Gamma_{A,rs}$ will lead to a much smaller $F_{obs,peak}$ than the observed. This negative result favors our opinion that these parameters for later forward and early reverse shocks are different, at least in the case of GRB 990123.

4. Summary and discussion

With the parameters for GRB 990123 provided in PK01, we have shown that the shell is thick but not thin. The adjusted light curve for the thick shell case can account for the observed light curve of the optical flash of GRB 990123. However the expected peak emission flux is much less than the observed. The parameters derived from the dense medium model by Dai & Lu (1999) have been considered, too, but the expected peak emission is still much less than observation. If the optical flash was really produced by the reverse shock, the parameters ϵ_B, ϵ_e, even p in optical flash should be much different from that in the late afterglow. Unfortunately there is no enough data for us to study it more quantitatively. New observations are needed to provide us a chance to understand optical flashes in more detail.

With eight GRBs' parameters, SR02 have estimated the reverse shock peak emission for seven bursts—for reasonable assumptions about the velocity of the source expansion, a strong optical flash $m_V \sim 9$ was expected from the reverse shock, then the best observational prospects for detecting these prompt flashes are high-lightened. It is easy to see that equation (6) in this note provides similar results. For instance: for GRB 000926, we have $F_{obs,peak} \sim 0.2(\Gamma_{rs} - 1)^{p-1}$Jy. Surprisingly, although many researchers have tried their best, there is no more optical flashes that have been observed (Akerlof et al. 2001; Kehoe et al.

2001). SR02 suggested that the dust obscuration seemed to be the most likely reason for non-detection. However, considered the discrepancy between the observed peak flux and the theoretically expected value, the reverse shock emission might be insignificant, more reliable model to explain that "unique" observation is needed.

We would like to thank D. M. Wei , X .Y. Wang, X. F. Wu and Z. Li for valuable discussion. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, the National 973 project (NKBRSF G19990754), the Special Funds for Major State Basic Research Projects, and the Foundation for the Author of National Excellent Doctoral Dissertation of P. R. China (Project No: 200125).

REFERENCES

Akerlof, C. W., Balsano, R., Barthelmy, S., et al.,1999, Nature, 398, 400

Akerlof, C. W., Balsano, R., Barthelmy, S., et al., 2001, ApJ, 554, L159

Blandford, R. D., Mackee, C. F., 1976, Physics. Fluids, 19, 1130

Briggs, M. S., Band, L. D., Kippen, R. M., et al., 1999, ApJ, 524, 82

Castro-Tirado, A. J., Rosa, M., Nicola, C., et al., 1999, Science, 283, 2069

Dai, Z. G., Huang, Y. F., Lu, T., 1999, ApJ, 520, 634

Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 1998, A&A, 333, L87

Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 1999, ApJ, 519, L155

Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000, ApJ, 537, 803

Fan, Y. Z., Dai, Z. G., Huang, Y. F., Lu, T., 2002, submitted to A&A

Fenimore, E. E., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., Wu, B. B., 1999, ApJ, 518, L73

Fenimore, E. E., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2000, submitted to ApJ, astro-ph/0004176

Fruchter, A. S., Pian, E., Gibbons, R., et al., 1999, ApJ, 519, L13

Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000a, A&A, 355, L43

Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000b, MNRAS, 2000b, 316, 943

Huang, Y. F., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000c, Chin. Phys. Lett., 17, 778

Huang, Y. F., Gou, L.J., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000d, ApJ, 543, 90

Kehoe, R., Akerlof, C., Balsano, R., et al., 2001, ApJL submitted, astro-ph/0104208

Kobayashi, S., 2000, ApJ, 545, 807

Kulkarni, S. R., Djorgovski, S. G., Odewahn, S. C., et al., 1999a, Nature, 398, 389

Kulkarni, S. R., et al., Frail, D. A., SAri, R., 1999b, ApJ, 522, L97

Liang, E. P., Crider, A., Böttcher, M., Smith, I. A., 1999, ApJ, 519, L21

Mészáros, P., Rees, M. J., 1999, MNRAS, 306, L39

Panaitescu. A., Kumar, P., 2001, ApJ, 560, L53 (PK01)

Rees, M. J., Mészáros, P., 1998, ApJ, 496, L1

Rhoads, J. E., 1999, ApJ, 525, 737

Sari, R., Piran, T., 1999, ApJ, 520, 641

Sari, R., Piran, T., Narayan, R., 1998, ApJ, 497, L17

Sari, R., Piran, T., Halpern, J. P., 1999, ApJ, 519, L17

Soderberg, A. M., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2002, MNRAS, 330, L24 (SR02)

Wang, X. Y., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2000, MNRAS, 319, 1159

Wang, X. Y., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2001a, ApJ, 546, L43

Wang, X. Y., Dai, Z. G., Lu, T., 2001b, ApJ, 556, 1010

Wei, D. M., Lu, T., 2000, ApJ, 541,203

Wijers, R. A. M. J., Galama, T. J., 1999, ApJ, 523, 177

Wu, X. F., Dai, Z. G., Huang, Y. F., Lu, T., 2002, submitted to MNRAS

This preprint was prepared with the AAS LaTeX macros v4.0.